least one business cycle. Under ordinary circumstances, the most appropriate full-year G&A period is that represented by the latest fiscal year for which the respondent has complete and audited financial statements.

IRCT provided no evidence to justify deviating from the Department's normal practice of using annual financial data for G&A. As of the last day of verification, IRCT's 1994 audited financial statements were not available. Consequently, we calculated G&A expense based on IRCT's 1993 annual audited financial statements.

Comment 12: Waste Water

The petitioner states that IRCT excluded certain waste water treatment expenses from its submitted COP. As BIA, the petitioner suggests that the Department include the accounts payable amount reported in IRCT's May 1994 Trial Balance.

The respondent asserts that it has properly included all waste water treatment costs in its submitted COP. It states that the particular account noted by the petitioner reflects costs associated with the purchase of waste water treatment equipment.

DOC Position

We agree with the respondent. The respondent included all waste water treatment expenses incurred during the POI in its COP submission. Therefore, no adjustment is required.

Comment 13: Insurance Proceeds

IRCT offset its submitted COP for furfuryl alcohol by insurance proceeds received due to an unexpected equipment failure during the POI. IRCT contends that it properly included insurance revenue received for both equipment repair costs and for the increase in per-unit costs resulting from the equipment failure.

The petitioner concedes that IRCT tied part of the insurance settlement directly to equipment repair costs and should be allowed a partial offset for these costs. According to the petitioner, however, IRCT did not show how the remaining proceeds relate to the company's claimed increase in per-unit costs.

DOC Position

We agree with the respondent that the insurance proceeds should be used to offset IRCT's furfuryl alcohol costs. During verification, we found that the insurance proceeds were paid to IRCT for equipment failure and overhead costs incurred during the period in which the equipment was under repair. Thus, these proceeds relate directly to the equipment failure which occurred during the POI. Due to this equipment failure, IRCT incurred higher per-unit production costs in addition to the cost of repairs. Accordingly, we consider it reasonable for IRCT to offset its submitted COP by all proceeds received for the insurance claim.

Suspension of Liquidation

In accordance with section 735(d) of the Act, we are directing the Customs Service to suspend liquidation of all entries of furfuryl alcohol from Thailand, as defined in the ''Scope of Investigation'' section of this notice, that are entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication of our final determination [1] in the **Federal Register**.

The Customs Service shall require a cash deposit or posting of a bond on all entries equal to the estimated amount by which the FMV exceeds the USP, as shown below. The suspension of liquidation will remain in effect until further notice.

Producer/manufacturer/exporter	Margin percentage
IRCT	5.94
All Others	5.94

ITC Notification

In accordance with section 735(d) of the Act, we have notified the ITC of our determination. The ITC will make its determination whether these imports materially injure, or threaten injury to, a U.S. industry within 45 days of the publication of this notice. If the ITC determines that material injury or threat of material injury does not exist, the proceeding will be terminated and all securities posted as a result of the suspension of liquidation will be refunded or cancelled.

However, if the ITC determines that such injury does exist, we will issue an antidumping duty order directing the Customs Service officers to assess an antidumping duty on furfuryl alcohol from Thailand, entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of suspension of liquidation, equal to the amount by which the foreign market value of the merchandise exceeds the United States price.

This determination is published pursuant to section 735(d) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1673(d)) and 19 CFR 353.20.

[1] The preliminary determination was negative in this case.

Dated: May 1, 1995.

Susan G. Esserman,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 95–11263 Filed 5–5–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[A–588–807]

Industrial Belts and Components and Parts Thereof, Whether Cured or Uncured, From Japan; Partial Termination and Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

AGENCY: Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of partial termination and preliminary results of antidumping duty administrative review.

SUMMARY: In response to requests from Mitsuboshi Belting Limited (MBL) and Nakamichi America Corporation (Nakamichi), the respondents, the Department of Commerce (the Department) initiated an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on industrial belts and components and parts thereof, whether cured or uncured (hereinafter referred to as industrial belts), from Japan. Subsequently, Nakamichi made a timely request to withdraw its request for an administrative review, and since there were no other requests for review of Nakamichi's exports to the United States, the Department is terminating its 1993/94 administrative review of Nakamichi. Therefore, this review covers one manufacturer/exporter, MBL, during the period June 1, 1993, through May 31, 1994.

As a result of this review, the Department has preliminarily determined to assess antidumping duties for MBL based upon the best information otherwise available (BIA). Interested parties are invited to comment on the preliminary results of this administrative review.

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 8, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Charles Vannatta in the Office of Antidumping Compliance; Import Administration; International Trade Administration; 14th & Constitution Avenue, N.W.; U.S. Department of Commerce; Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone number (202) 482–5253.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Applicable Statute and Regulations

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute and to the Department's regulations are references

to the provisions as they existed on December 31, 1994.

Background

On June 14, 1989, the Department published in the **Federal Register** (54 FR 25314) the antidumping order on industrial belts from Japan. On June 16, 1994, and June 30, 1994, Nakamichi and MBL, respectively, requested that the Department conduct an administrative review of the period June 1, 1993, through May 31, 1994. The Department published a notice of initiation of the antidumping administrative review on July 15, 1994 (59 FR 36160). The Department is now conducting this administrative review in accordance with section 751 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Tariff Act).

On September 2, 1994, the Department received a timely request from Nakamichi to withdraw its request for an administrative review. There were no other requests from interested parties for an administrative review of Nakamichi. Therefore, with respect to Nakamichi, the Department is terminating this administrative review, in part, in accordance with 19 CFR 353.22(a)(5).

On July 19, 1994, the Department presented its questionnaire to the counsel for MBL requesting information concerning MBL's U.S. and home market sales made during the period of review. MBL did not respond to the Department's request for information.

Scope of the Review

Imports covered by the review are shipments of industrial belts and components and parts thereof, whether cured or uncured, from Japan. These products include V-belts, synchronous belts, and other industrial belts, in part or wholly of rubber or plastic, and containing textile fiber (including glass fiber) or steel wire, cord or strand, and whether in endless (*i.e.*, closed loops) belts, or in belting in lengths or links. This review excludes conveyor belts and automotive belts, as well as front engine drive belts found on equipment powered by internal combustion engines, including trucks, tractors, buses, and lift trucks.

During the period of review, the merchandise was classifiable under Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS) subheadings 3926.90.55, 3926.90.56, 3926.90.57, 3926.90.59, 3926.90.60, 4010.10.10, 4010.10.50, 4010.91.11, 4010.91.15, 4010.91.19, 4010.91.50, 4010.99.11, 4010.99.15, 4010.99.19, 4010.99.50, 5910.00.10, 5910.00.90, and 7326.20.00. The HTS subheadings are provided for convenience and Customs purposes. The written description remains dispositive.

For these preliminary results, this review covers sales and entries made during the period of review from one Japanese manufacturer and exporter of industrial belts to the United States, Mitsuboshi Belting Limited.

Best Information Available

In accordance with section 776(c) of the Tariff Act, the Department has preliminarily determined that the use of BIA is appropriate for MBL. In determining what to use as BIA, 19 CFR 353.37(b) provides that the Department may take into account whether a party fails to provide requested information. When a company fails to provide the information requested in a timely manner, or otherwise significantly impedes the Department's review, the Department considers that company to be uncooperative, and, in accordance with its two-tier BIA methodology, generally assigns to that company the higher of (1) the highest rate for any company for the same class or kind of merchandise from any previous review or the original investigation, or (2) the highest rate for a responding firm with shipments of the same class or kind of merchandise during the current review period (*Antifriction Bearings (Other Than Tapered Roller Bearings) and Parts Thereof From the Federal Republic of Germany, et al; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 56 FR 31692, 31704–05 (July 11, 1991); *Allied-Signal Aerospace Co.* v. *United States*, 996 F.2d 1185 (Fed. Cir. 1993)).

Because MBL did not respond to the Department's request for information, the Department has used the rate from the less-than-fair-value investigation to establish MBL's margin in accordance with the first tier of the Department's two-tier BIA methodology. This rate is 93.16 percent.

Preliminary Results of Review

The Department preliminarily determines that MBL's margin for this administrative review is 93.16 percent.

Parties to the proceeding may request disclosure and/or an administrative protective order within five days of the date of publication of this notice. Interested parties may also request a public hearing within 10 days of the date of publication of this notice. Any hearing, if requested, will be held 44 days after the date of publication, or the first workday thereafter. Case briefs and/or written comments may be submitted to the Department not later than 30 days after the date of publication. Rebuttal briefs and rebuttals to written comments, limited to issues raised in those comments, may be filed with the Department not later than 37 days after the date of publication. The Department will include in its publication of the final results of administrative review an analysis of the issues raised in any written comments or at the hearing.

Upon completion of the final results of this administrative review, the Department will determine, and the U.S. Customs Service will assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Individual differences between the United States price and the foreign market value may vary from the percentage stated above. The Department will issue appraisement instructions directly to the U.S. Customs Service.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective upon completion of the final results of this administrative review for all shipments of industrial belts from Japan, entered for consumption, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after its publication date, as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Tariff Act:

(1) The cash deposit rate for MBL will be that established in the final results of this administrative review;

(2) For subject merchandise exported by manufacturers or exporters not covered in this review but covered in previous reviews or in the original less-than-fair-value investigation, a cash deposit based upon the most recently published rate in a final result or determination for which the manufacturer or exporter received a company-specific rate;

(3) For subject merchandise exported by an exporter not covered in this review, a prior review, or the original investigation, but where the manufacturer of the merchandise has been covered by this or a prior final result or determination, a cash deposit based upon the most recently published company-specific rate for that manufacturer; and

(4) For merchandise exported by all other manufacturers and exporters who are not covered by this or any previous administrative review conducted by the Department, the cash deposit rate will be the ''all others'' rate established in the less-than-fair-value investigation, 93.16 percent.

These cash deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until the publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This notice also serves as a preliminary reminder to all importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 353.26 to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties

prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during the review period. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Secretary's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred, and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

This administrative review and notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Tariff Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)) and 19 CFR 353.22(c)(5).

Dated: April 19, 1995.

Susan G. Esserman,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 95–11258 Filed 5–5–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–M

[C–549–802]

Ball Bearings and Parts Thereof From Thailand; Preliminary Results of a Countervailing Duty Administrative Review

AGENCY: Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of preliminary results of countervailing duty administrative review.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting an administrative review of the countervailing duty order on ball bearings and parts thereof from Thailand. We preliminarily determine the total bounty or grant to be 4.29 percent *ad valorem* for all companies for the period January 1, 1992, through December 31, 1992. If the final results remain the same as these preliminary results of administrative review, we will instruct U.S. Customs Service to assess countervailing duties as indicated above. We invite interested parties to comment on these preliminary results.

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 8, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Martina Tkadlec or Kelly Parkhill, Office of Countervailing Compliance, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230, telephone: (202) 482–2786.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On May 3, 1989, the Department published in the **Federal Register** (54 FR 19130) the countervailing duty order on ball bearings and parts thereof from Thailand. On April 28, 1993, the Department published in the **Federal Register** a notice of ''Opportunity to Request Administrative Review'' (58 FR 25802) of this countervailing duty order. On May 28, 1993, Torrington Company, the petitioner, requested an administrative review of the order. On May 28, 1993, Pelmec Thai Ltd. (Pelmec) and NMB Thai Ltd. (NMB Thai), the respondent companies in prior reviews also requested an administrative review.

On June 25, 1993 (58 FR 34414), we initiated the review, covering the period January 1, 1992, through December 31, 1992. The review covers nine programs and three related producers/exporters, NMB Thai, Pelmec, and NMB Hi-Tech Bearings Ltd. (NMB Hi-Tech), which are wholly owned by Minebea, Co., Ltd. of Japan.

Applicable Statute and Regulations

The Department is conducting this administrative review in accordance with section 751(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act). Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute and to the Department's regulations are in reference to the provisions as they existed on December 31, 1994.

Scope of Review

Imports covered by this review are ball bearings and parts thereof. Such merchandise is described in detail in Appendix A to this notice. The *Harmonized Tariff Schedule* (HTS) item numbers listed in Appendix A are provided for convenience and Customs purposes. The written description remains dispositive.

Calculation Methodology

In the first administrative review, respondents claimed that the F.O.B. value of the subject merchandise entering the United States is greater than the F.O.B. price charged by the companies in Thailand (57 FR 26646; June 15, 1992). They explained that this discrepancy is due to a mark-up charged by the parent company, located in a third country, through which the merchandise is invoiced. However, the subject merchandise is shipped directly from Thailand to the United States and is not transshipped, combined with other merchandise, or repackaged with other merchandise. In other words, for each shipment of subject merchandise, there are two invoices and two corresponding F.O.B. export prices: (1) The F.O.B. export price at which the subject merchandise leaves Thailand, and on which subsidies from the Royal Thai Government (RTG) are earned by the companies, and upon which the subsidy rate is calculated; and (2) the F.O.B. export price which includes the parent company mark-up, and which is listed on the invoice accompanying the subject merchandise as it enters the United States, and upon which the cash deposits are collected and the countervailing duty is assessed. Respondents argued that the calculated *ad valorem* rate should be adjusted by the ratio of the export value from Thailand to the export value charged by the parent company to the U.S. customer so that the amount of countervailing duties collected would reflect the amount of subsidies bestowed. The Department agreed and made this adjustment in the first and second administrative reviews (57 FR 26646; June 15, 1992; and 58 FR 36392; July 7, 1993).

In the present review, we again verified on a transaction-specific basis the direct correlation between the invoice which reflect the F.O.B. price on which the subsidies are earned and the invoice which reflects the marked-up price that accompanies each shipment as it enters the United States. Since the mark-up is not part of the export value upon which the respondents earn bounties or grants, the Department has followed the methodology adopted in the first and second administrative reviews, and calculated the *ad valorem* rate as a percentage of the original export value from Thailand and then multiplied this rate by the adjustment ratio—the original export value from Thailand divided by the marked-up value of the goods entering the United States.

We did not calculate a separate rate for each company because NMB Thai, Pelmec, and NMB Hi-Tech are wholly owned by one parent company, and are therefore related. As a result of this relationship, we considered the three companies as one corporate entity in our calculations. We calculated the bounty or grant by first totalling the benefits received by the three companies for each program used. Dividing these sums by total Thai export value for the three companies, we calculated the adjusted bounty or grant for each program used. As described above, we adjusted these rates by multiplying them by the ratio of the original export price from Thailand to the marked-up price of the goods entering the United States. Finally, we summed the adjusted bounty or grant for each program, to arrive at the total country-wide bounty or grant.